REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 20-25, 27-31 and 35-57 were pending and rejected claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 20-25, 27-31 and 35-57. Claims 27, 35, 37, 42, and 50 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 58 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 20-25, 27-31 and 35-58 are pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Examiner Interview

The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration in discussing the present claims and the prior art on April 9, 2007. We have added claim 58 which we believe embodies the amendment discussed at the Interview that would distinguish the claim from the prior art.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 20-25, 27-31 and 35-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Herr-Hoyman, U.S. Patent No. 5,727,156 and Freishtat, U.S. Patent No. 5,945,989.

Herr-Hoyman discusses a WWW producer with an open area on a server and a mechanism for opening it and charging the associated account. This is accomplished by an "author authoring the hypertext pages on a client computer, sending an add request to a server computer, causing the generation of a unique identifier for the author of the hypertext document, obtaining a charge authorization from the author." Column 1 lines 36-40. In response to this the client receives a "unique identifier" and is further provided with "a password needed to effect future modifications." Column 1 lines 46-48.

Herr-Hoyman, column 2 lines 15-20 states:

> The connections are typically TCP/IP (Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol) connections, but other connections and protocols are also possible. For example, the connection between author computer 12 and author ISP 14 might be a SLIP/PPP (Serial Link IP/Point-to-Point Protocol) connection.

The reference merely discusses a connection between an author computer and an author ISP. Nothing teach or suggest a "set information obtaining unit." With reference to Fig. 1 of the present application the set information obtaining unit 22 is at a layer above and distinguishable from the TCP/IP or SLIP/PPP connection of Herr-Hoyman as quoted above. Therefore, Herr-

Hoyman fails to teach or suggest "a set information obtaining unit which is provided for said client," as in claim 1.

> Herr-Hoyman, column 3 lines 57 -62 states:

> The unique ID (C__ID field) is generated based on the company name supplied by the client. In a preferred embodiment, the unique ID is a short sequence of characters related to the company name, possibly including additional characters or digits to ensure that the generated unique ID is unique with respect to all previous generated unique ID's.

> Herr-Hoyman, column 3 lines 57 -62 states:

> Local variables include the author's business or personal name, the unique ID associated with the web site, and possibly an encrypted credit card number and a modification password. A list of other local variables is shown in Appendix A. Local variables 42 contain sufficient information to pas from site launcher client 44 to SWUP module 46 in order to correctly verify authorization and correctly locate the destination for the uploaded web files and database information.

The first passage appears to discuss generating a unique ID and the second passage discusses verifying authorization. Neither of these passages teach or suggest performing either function upon the **connection to a network**. Further, in the *Response to Arguments*, the Examiner states that two above quoted passages "include a unique ID and a password ... generated upon **connection to the server**." (Emphasis added). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Further, the claim is to a "connection to the network," not a "connection to the server" as the Examiner states. Thus the claim is directed to a connection to a network when an initial connection to the network is made. Therefore, Herr-Hoyman and Freishtat fail to teach or suggest "provided upon connection to the network," as in claim 1.

Claims 12, 20, 27, 35, 42, 50 and 57 have similar elements to claim 1. Therefore, Herr-Hoyman and Freishtat taken separately or in combination fail to teach the elements of claims 1, 12, 20, 27, 35, 42, 50 and 57 or the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 4 is allowable as being dependent from an otherwise allowable independent claim. Claim 4 is also allowable, as the prior art fails to teach or suggest "wherein in the case where a connection to a network is a dial-up connection, said set information obtaining unit obtains the user identification information which is used for said information obtaining request from a setting input of the dial-up connection." As the claim makes clear that the set information obtaining unit is separate from the dial-up connection.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 58 is new. Support for claim found in Fig. 2 and page 3 lines 11-27 of the Application. The prior art failing to teach or suggest that user identification information is received upon an initial connection to a network.

SUMMARY

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 25, 2007   By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
                                    James J. Livingston, Jr.
                                    Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501